REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 have been amended. Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Support for the amendments to the claim can be found the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the final action and allowance of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 recites a projection system comprising:

a projection display;

at least one light source; and

a sensor means for sensing and compensating for changes in the luminous flux emitted by the at least one light source, wherein the at least one light source is configured to have a focal plane situated at an entering face of a rod integrator of the projection system, the rod integrator being positioned in between the at least one light source and the projection display, wherein the focal plane of the at least one light source is subject to change or shift due to instabilities of the at least one light source, wherein light emitted from the at least one light source comprises first and second spatial components (I) and (R) at the entering face which impinge on (i) a central transparent first region and (ii) a second mirrored region, surrounding the first region, respectively, of the entering face of the rod integrator and wherein the light emitted from the at least one light source further comprises a third spatial component (M) which fails to impinge on the entering face and instead is directed (iii) into a region immediately surrounding the entering face, and wherein the sensor means comprises a sensor arrangement configured in a region of the entering face to sense,

along a circumference of the rod integrator with weightings that are as equal as possible, the third spatial component of the light from the light source that is directed into the region immediately surrounding the entering face.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in the specification at least on page 4, lines 17-29; page 5, lines 18-27; page 6, lines 3-7 and 28-34; and FIGs. 1-3. In addition, claims 5, 6 and 8 where amended for at least providing proper antecedent basis.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Luerkens (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0020412). With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reason.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131 that

> *"[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."*

Therefore, with respect to claim 1, to sustain this rejection the Luerkens reference must contain all of the above claimed elements of the respective claims. However, contrary to the examiner's position that all elements are disclosed in the Luerkens reference, the latter reference does not disclose a "sensor means for sensing and compensating for changes in the luminous flux ... wherein the ... *light source* is configured to have a *focal plane* situated at an *entering face of* a *rod integrator* ... the *rod integrator* being positioned in between the ... light source and the projection display, ... the *focal plane* ... subject to change or shift due to instabilities of the ... light source, wherein light emitted from the ... light source comprises *first* and *second spatial components (I) and (R)* at the *entering face* [of the rod integrator] which impinge on (i) a *central transparent first region* and (ii) a *second mirrored region*, surrounding the first

region, respectively, of the *entering face* of the *rod integrator* **and** … a *third spatial component (M)* which *fails* to impinge on the *entering face* [of the rod integrator] *and instead* is directed (iii) into a *region immediately surrounding the entering face* [of the rod integrator], **and** … a sensor arrangement configured in a region of the *entering face* [of the rod integrator] to sense, *along a circumference* … with *weightings* that are as *equal* as possible, the *third* spatial component of the light …" as is claimed in claim 1.

In contrast, Luerkens discloses the use of a "*brightness sensor* 130 … positioned *adjacent to* or *inside* the *image generator* 424 such that it [*i.e., the brightness sensor*] *catches* the *quantity of light incident on* the *image generator*" [Emphasis added] (see Luerkens on paragraph [0042], lines 3-5). Accordingly, Luerkens does not teach a "*light source* … configured to have a *focal plane* situated at an *entering face of* a *rod integrator* … the *rod integrator* being positioned in between the … light source and the projection display, … wherein light emitted from the … light source comprises *first* and *second spatial components (I) and (R)* at the *entering face* [of the rod integrator] which impinge on (i) a *central transparent first region* and (ii) a *second mirrored region*, surrounding the first region, respectively, of the *entering face* of the *rod integrator* **and** … a *third spatial component (M)* which *fails* to impinge on the *entering face* [of the rod integrator] *and instead* is directed (iii) into a *region immediately surrounding the entering face* [of the rod integrator], **and** … a sensor arrangement configured in a region of the *entering face* [of the rod integrator] to sense, *along a circumference* … with *weightings* that are as *equal* as possible, the *third* spatial component of the light …" as is claimed in claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the Luerkens reference and should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested.

Dependent claim 3 depends from and further limits allowable independent claim 1 and therefore is allowable as well. Accordingly, the rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luerkens in view of Allen (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0179192). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reason. Dependent claims 2 and 9 depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Accordingly, the rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luerkens in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent 6,188,427). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reason. Dependent claims 4-7 depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Accordingly, the rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luerkens in view of Morgan (Pub. No. 2003/0227465). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reason. Dependent claim 8 depends from and further limits allowable independent claim 1 and therefore is allowable as well. Accordingly, the rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Except as indicated herein, the claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve their right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or a continuation application.

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-9 depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well.

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings; therefore, no new matter is introduced.

Withdrawal of the final action and issuance of an early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica
Registration No. 34,291
for Frank Keegan, Reg. No. 50,145

Dated: 2/24/08

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
Telephone: 914-333-9669
Facsimile: 914-332-0615
File: DE020178US

a-32658.189